

**From:** [ANDERSON Jim M](#)  
**To:** [Chip.Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Subject:** RE: update on Blumenaur meeting presentations  
**Date:** 04/19/2011 11:40 AM

---

Chip,  
Thanks. The slide at bottom is 1 Jim McK presented at last week's CAG.  
I have a hard copy. I can bring it to the TCT mtg tomorrow if you want.  
Let me know.  
Jim

-----Original Message-----  
From: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov  
[mailto:Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 11:37 AM  
To: ANDERSON Jim M  
Subject: Fw: update on Blumenaur meeting presentations

Jim - FYI on the LWG and Dave Stone portions of the agenda. The flow chart at the bottom is not very clear on this pdf - will try to get a full size copy - but you may recognize it as a slide that they have used in CAG presentations in the past.

Chip

----- Forwarded by Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US on 04/19/2011 11:33 AM  
-----

Re: update on Blumenaur meeting presentations (Document link: Chip Humphrey)

Chip Humphrey

to:

Dan Opalski, Kristine Koch, Deb Yamamoto

04/14/2011

03:24 PM

A quick update

Bob and Jim have been pretty tightly scripted by the LWG for their portion on project status/schedule. An advance copy of the points they plan to cover is attached. We'll be working with them to fill this in a bit more - some level of discussion on the schedule changes since the last meeting; and how we got there (without getting into a back & forth), what is underway to get the FS back on track, and the post-FS process. The flow chart at the bottom was helpful in addressing some of the confusion that is out there re: evaluating risk scenarios vs making decisions on final cleanup numbers.

(See attached file: LWG April 22.pdf)

Elizabeth and I had a good discussion with Dave Stone today. He is planning to give a 10-15 minute, 10,000 ft level presentation that he is still working on. He said he is not planning it as a presentation on the PH risk assessments (he hasn't even reviewed it in any detail). It will be more general info on how toxicologists evaluate risks, some illustrations (dose/response curves), science vs regulatory policy decisions. He's not interested in advocating a PRP perspective, and hasn't been asked to do so by the Port. He also not interested in, as he put it, "tossing a grenade" in the room. He does feel that the scientific underpinnings of non-cancer risk estimates are in better shape than cancer risk estimates. He also believes that risk communication needs to balance the risk vs benefits of fish consumption.

A couple of other things we discussed: He wasn't aware that non-cancer risks may end up being a driver in determining cleanup levels. He is supportive of the breastmilk scenario that was recently added to risk assessment.

I think the main caution will not be Dave's presentation, but what might come up in the Q & A that follows. Dave has no interest in getting into

or facilitating a heated debate on the topic. I'm going to be touching base with Hillary tomorrow to see how this matches up with her expectations.

Chip